## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. The Applicant has carefully considered the official communication dated January 13, 2006. Applicant respectfully submits that the amendment and the following remarks are fully responsive to the official communication.

2. The claims have been amended in light of the official communication. It is submitted that no new matter has been added as a result of the amendment.

3. The Examiner has rejected claims 1 to 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Claims 1 and 6 have been amended to make a distinction between "a first integrated circuit" (understood to mean a "chip") and "a second integrated circuit". "Accessory has been replaced by "consumable" which is used in the specification and is commonly understood to mean a component with a definite lifespan and that is customarily replaced. Furthermore, reference to "random number generator" has been replaced by reference to "random number function".

4. The Examiner has stated that the specification does not teach how two circuits could both generate the same random number. Claims 1 and 6, as amended, do not set out that the two integrated circuits each generate a random number. Rather, it is the integrated circuit of the "device" that generates the random number.

5. The Examiner has rejected claims 1 to 6 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

6. In support of this, the Examiner has stated that it is unclear how a random number generator is defined. The claim has been amended to emphasize the fact that the second integrated circuit is configured to hold a random number function. It is respectfully submitted it is well known in the art that random number functions can easily be held by chips (integrated circuits).

7. The Examiner has stated that R is not defined. On page 36 of the specification as filed, R is defined as a "current random number". In fact, it is respectfully submitted that it is well known in the art for R to represent a random number. The use of the symbol R provides a simple manner in which functional operations using the random number R can be indicated. Thus, claim 1 has been amended to precede "R" with "random number".

8. The Examiner has set out in claim 3 that "the integrated circuit" is an unclear reference. Claim 3 has been amended to address this (see above).

9. The Examiner has also rejected claims 1 and 3 to 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Koopman et. al. (US 5,363,448).

10. Claims 1 and 6, as amended, describe an apparatus and method for validating the authenticity of a consumable. In those claims, the integrated circuit of the device generates a random number. Both the integrated circuits of the device and the consumable apply a common secret key K to the random number with a function. The two returned values are compared. It is respectfully submitted that this feature is neither disclosed nor suggested in Koopman et. al.

11. Koopman et. al. realates to a vehicle door lock 30 (i.e. validating apparatus) which can be activated by one or more remote fobs 16 (i.e. devices to be authenticated). Each fob 16 is associated with the vehicle (and therefore the door lock) which, in turn, stores a unique identifier (ID) for the fob 16 (see lines 21 to 41 in col. 5). During unlocking of the door lock 30, the fob 16 transmits an encrypted signal including the fob ID to the door lock 30 receiver. The signal is encrypted using a pseudorandom number generator (see lines 55 to 58 of col. 6). The received signal is decrypted by the door lock and the received fob ID is then authenticated by the door lock using a ID register 100 (see line 63 col. 8 to line 4 col. 9). The fob 16 and door lock are only capable of simplex (i.e. one way) communication.

12. In contrast to claim 1, Koopman et. al. does not disclose that the vehicle door lock 30 (i.e. validating apparatus) generates a random number. Furthermore, Koopman et. al. does not disclose that the vehicle door lock 30 (i.e. validating apparatus) receives data from the fob (i.e. first integrated circuit of the device to be authenticated) which was generated using the random number which, in turn, was generated by the vehicle door lock 30 (i.e. second integrated circuit of the validating apparatus). Koopman et. al. neither discloses nor suggests that the fob 30 (i.e. device to be authenticated) can receive and use the random number generated by the door lock 30 (i.e. second integrated circuit) to generate data (a returned value), and then return the data the door lock to thereby perform duplex communication. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1 and 6 are neither anticipated nor obvious in light of Koopman et. al.

13. We respectfully submit that claims 2 to 5 are novel and not obvious as they depend upon claim 1 which, in turn, is novel and not obvious, as respectfully submitted above.

14. The Applicant has updated Page 1 of the specification by deleting its first line and replacing it with a paragraph entitled "Cross-Reference to Related Applications" showing full priority details. The Applicant submits that these amendments introduce no new matter. A replacement declaration is enclosed.

It is respectfully submitted that all of the Examiner's objections have been successfully traversed. Accordingly, it is submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of this application are courteously solicited.

Very respectfully,

Applicant: 

KIA SILVERBROOK

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com
Telephone: +612 9818 6633
Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762